

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

SCIENTIFIC GAMES CORPORATION, et al.,) Case No. 2:17-cv-00343-JAD-NJK
Petitioners,) ORDER
vs.)
AGS LLC,)
Respondent.)

On February 1 and 15, 2017, Petitioners and Respondent filed motions to seal that the Court denied without prejudice on February 16, 2017, for failure to include points and authorities. Docket Nos. 3, 5, 13. On February 22, 2017, Petitioners filed a renewed motion to seal. Docket No. 17. No response to that motion was filed. *See* Docket. Similarly, on February 24, 2017, Respondent filed a renewed motion to seal. Docket No. 19. Petitioners did not oppose that motion. *See* Docket No. 34 at 3.

On March 21, 2017, the Court found that Petitioners' renewed motion to seal failed to satisfy the relevant standard. Docket No. 33. The Court therefore instructed the Clerk's Office to keep the documents at issue in that motion sealed for the time being and ordered Petitioners to submit a supplemental brief. *Id.* at 4. On March 27, 2017, Petitioners responded to the Court's order, submitting that they need not pursue their motion to seal because Respondent's separately filed renewed motion to seal adequately protected Petitioners' and Respondent's interests. Docket No. 34. On April 3, 2017, therefore, the Court denied Petitioners' renewed motion to seal as moot. Docket No. 35.

On April 3, 2017, the Court issued an order regarding Respondent’s renewed motion to seal, finding that it had made a particularized showing of good cause to seal certain documents, but not others. *See* Docket No. 36. The Court therefore ordered Respondent to submit supplemental briefing as to Docket Nos. 1-1 at 103-118 and Docket Nos. 7, 7-1, 7-2, 7-3, 7-4, 10, 10-1, 10-2, 10-3,

1 10-4, 11, and 14, no later than April 11, 2017. Docket No. 36 at 4-5. The Court advised Respondent
2 that if it did not submit supplemental briefing by that date, the Court would order those documents
3 unsealed. *Id.* at 5. No supplemental briefing was filed. *See* Docket. On April 20, 2017, therefore,
4 the Court ordered Respondent to show cause, no later than April 25, 2017, why the documents at
5 Docket Nos. 1-1 at 103-118 and 7, 7-1, 7-2, 7-3, 7-4, 10, 10-1, 10-2, 10-3, 10-4, 11, 14, and 16
6 should not be unsealed.

7 On April 25, 2017, Respondent filed a response to the Court's order to show cause. Docket
8 No. 38. Respondent submits that the document at Docket No. 1-1 at 103-118 is a settlement
9 agreement to which it is not party. *Id.* at 4-6. Therefore, Respondent submits, it does not have
10 standing to request that the document be sealed and can articulate no particularized showing of harm
11 that would occur if the Court unsealed the document. *Id.* Respondent further submits that it does
12 not object to unsealing Docket Nos. 7, 7-1, 7-2, 7-3, 7-4, 10, 10-1, 10-2, 10-3, 10-4, 11, and 14. *Id.*
13 at 5-6. Respondent does not address Docket No. 16. *See id.*

14 Accordingly, Respondent's motion to seal, Docket No. 19, is hereby **GRANTED** in part and
15 **DENIED** in part for the reasons set forth in the order at Docket No. 36 and in this order. The Court
16 **INSTRUCTS** the Clerk's Office to unseal Docket Nos. 1-1, 1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 7, 7-1, 7-2, 7-3, 7-4, 8,¹
17 10, 10-1, 10-2, 10-3, 10-4, 11, 14, and 16. The Court **ORDERS** Petitioners to file their motion to
18 compel, Docket No. 1, on the public docket, with the redactions that the Court has previously
19 approved.

20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 DATED: April 27, 2017.

22 
23 NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge

24
25
26 ¹ Docket No. 8 is identical to Docket No. 11, which Respondent does not oppose unsealing.
27 *See* Docket No. 8; Docket No. 11; Docket No. 38 at 5-6.